

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VIII.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1853.

NO. 11.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

TERMS.--Single copy, for one year, \$1; six copies, \$5; thirteen copies, \$10; always in advance.

HUMAN MATERIALISM.

MATERIALISM AND PHRENOLOGY.

"We ask at once, and without hesitation, *what*, although Phrenology did teach materialism? We have already pointed out the absurdity of an argument *a priori*, against a system claiming to be founded on facts. If it be said materialism leads to infidelity, it would be well for the speaker to consider whether the admission may not be an argument against Christianity, rather than against Phrenology. Let those who urge the cry of scepticism, examine their hearts and see whether *they* be not the true infidels, who cannot depend upon the promises of God, unless there is something in the very substance of the soul which renders its annihilation impossible! So far from giving those men credit for extra piety and evangelistic faith, who talk so loudly of the grossness of organized matter, and disclaim so earnestly about the corrupt vileness of the human body, as has been hitherto the fashion, we confess we are much more inclined to accuse them of *discontent* with the condition of existence which the Almighty has been pleased to appoint, and of blaspheming a form and a substance capable, to our sense, of a perfection and a sublimation which surpasses in its grace and nobility all that we can conceive of the disembodied spirit of modern theorists. The Christian builds *his* hopes, not upon the indestructible essence of the human soul, but upon the *sure* promises of the Gospel.

* * * * *

It by no means strengthens our conviction of Lord Brougham's belief in Christianity, that he has chosen to peril the doctrine of human immortality exclusively upon a rejection of that of materialism. His discourse of Natural Theology reminds us forcibly of the excellence of the proverb, *ne sutor ultra crepidam*, and proves that a great orator may be a very indifferent metaphysician. We pass over, by merely noticing his assertion, that the mind could conceive of, and reason upon, all the abstractions of numbers and mathematical problems without any notion of externality; and, retorting the proposition, by the averment, that the knowledge of their phenomena is altogether matter of experience, and is therefore least of all independent of the external world, seeing that they are inventions and discoveries confined to civilized life, and not even imagined by the ignorant and the savage. But we cannot suppress our surprise at the unskilful manner in

which his Lordship avails himself of the old argument derived from consciousness. We *know*, he contends, that every particle of the human body is changed once in six or seven years; we feel assured, from the evidence of our consciousness, that our mind is the same intellect, and that we are the same entity now, that we were forty years before: the body having changed and our being conscious that the mind has not, ergo, the body is not the mind! Here his Lordship has perilled his whole case upon the infallibility of consciousness, while it is certain that we are as little conscious of any change in the body as of alteration in the identity of mind. He has also forgotten, that the transmutation which takes place in the intellect between the period of infancy and manhood, is as presumptive of a renovation of substance as the renovation of the corporeal particles. But above all, if mere identity were conclusive of spirituality, it would *prove the body was immaterial in its structure and qualities*, however gross in its substance. Although the *particles* of the body undergo a transformation, its diseases, colors, (natural and artificial, like tatooing, &c.) shapes, peculiar susceptibilities remain permanent, fixed, unalterable. The idiosyncracies of the system are never eradicated, or changed; the marks of the same wounds (often strikingly illustrated in the hands and face of coal miners), and virulence of the same tumours exist unabated, although all the particles of which they were composed have probably been obliterated and renewed at least ten times over. Thus, the profound discovery in metaphysics, if it be available for any purpose whatever, proves that the laws of *mind and body are identical in their phenomena*, and establishes upon the very basis of the spirituality of the soul, the immateriality of the body! But forsooth, his Lordship will not admit the existence of matter, unless the independence of mind be conceded; and thus the question of immortality is argued in the style of a special pleading in the Court of Chancery. What becomes of the favorite solving apparatus of consciousness here? What would have been the sense of individuality, but for an external material world?

"When Bishop Berkeley said, there was no matter, There was no matter what he said."

The existence of matter must be conceded, in an argument which has for its object the proof that *there is something besides*, and when that is admitted, the proof rests with the sceptic, who conceives that the intervention of some other principle is necessary to account for the phenomena presented to our experience. The hidden qualities of this substance must be detected, and its whole attributes known, before we can be warranted in *assuming the existence of something else* as necessary to the production of what is presented to our consciousness. And when such a principle as that of galvanism or electricity, confessedly a property of matter, can be present in, or absent from a body, attract, repel and move, without adding to, or subtracting

from the weight, heat, size, color, or any other quality of a corpuscle,—it will require some better species of logic than any hitherto presented, to establish the impossibility of mind being a certain form, quality, or accessory of matter, inherent in and never separated from it. We do not argue thus because we are confident that there exists nothing but matter, for, in truth, our feeling is, that the question is involved in too much mystery, to entitle us to speak with the boldness of settled conviction on either side. But we assume this position, because we think the *onus probandi* (burden of proof) falls on the spiritualists, and that they have not established the necessity of inferring the existence of another entity besides matter, to account for all the phenomena of mind, by having failed to exhaust all the possible qualities or probable capabilities of that substance which they labor so assiduously to degrade and despise. But while they have altogether failed to establish this necessity, whereon depends their entire proposition, they have recourse to the usual expedients of unsuccessful logicians, by exciting the ignorant prejudices of bigotry, and intolerance, against all that is dignified with the name of dispassionate philosophy.

The truth is, it is time that all this fudge and cant about the doctrine of materialism, which affects the theory of immortality in no shape whatever,—as the God who appointed the end, could as easily ordain that the means might be either through the medium of matter or spirit,—should be fairly put down by men of common sense and metaphysical discrimination.”—*Sidney Smith's "Principles of Phrenology,"* 1838.

MATERIALISM AND IMMATERIALISM, AND THEIR MORAL AND RELIGIOUS BEARINGS.

The extract we are about to present is long; but an intelligent reader, we apprehend, will find it worthy of deliberate consideration. To some statements in this extract, we, of course, object, because they jar with the Bible doctrine of the human soul and spirit; nevertheless, apart from these, it contains information that is valuable, and reasoning that is sound.—*Ed. of Expositor.*

“The supposed tendency of modern physiology to materialism has peculiarly alarmed Protestant divines. We are not concerned with the truth or falsehood of the opposite theories which have been advanced on this subject; but with their religious aspect. The author of this volume (*Vestiges*,) is a decided Materialist; but he holds that this does not in the slightest degree affect the truths of Theism, since the development of faculties whereby we suppose we surpass the brutes, is precisely that which puts us into contact with Deity. The whole subject of materialism has been so involved in verbal controversy, that we desire to try to clear off much that is extraneous.

“First, let it be observed, that if, (according to a current opinion) materialism consists in supposing that the soul possesses weight, extension, visibility, and other properties of matter, all the ancients were materialists. Beyond a doubt, Job, Ezekiel, and John, equally with Plato, Cicero, and the Christian fathers, conceived of spirit as nothing but thin matter, vapor or gas; and the philosophic idea of spirit,

now current in the regions of learning, is not older than the days of the European schoolmen. It is at once evident that the recent philosophy cannot be of essential moment to religion. But such a view of materialism is for many reasons unsatisfactory.—Electricity, light, and heat, are regarded even by those moderns who hold the corpuscular theory concerning the two last, to be void of gravitation, and (we believe) of inertia. Yet it is evidently materialism to teach that the substance of the soul is made of these ingredients. Next; to those who will have it that nothing is spirit which has a proper attachment to *space* and *time*, we think it may be fairly replied that our souls do not fulfil this condition. If we know anything about them at all, it is that they stand in most intimate relation to our bodies, and are susceptible of change, growth, and decay, with the progress of time.

* * * * *

“We further assert, that the doctrine of materialism, if it be ever so true, ought not to affect any doctrine of morality or of religion, rightly so called. To put this in a strong light, let us be allowed to make an extravagant supposition, which will give every advantage to the opposite argument. Suppose that a future Mr. Crosse should succeed in constructing a living dog out of inorganic matter, by a series of galvanic operations, and that this dog should display all the sagacity and affection of other dogs; this would be the most decisive imaginable proof of the identity of that substance by which brutes think, feel, and live, with electricity and other forces which act on unorganic matter, yet such an experiment would not have the most remote tendency to undo our experience and our internal perceptions that truth, justice, disinterestedness, humility, compassion, and purity, are better than their opposites; it could not justly lower our reverence and admiration for the great Power who presides over the universe which we behold, or alter in any point the posture of our hearts and spirits towards Him. The sphere of religion is the inner and moral world; and as no external discoveries of philosophy, change the moral and spiritual nature of man, fear of any permanent harm to religion from this quarter is vain. Unwillingly, however, we must confess that such fears do *temporarily* verify themselves. For if the professors of religion proclaim that certain doctrines of philosophy are subversive of religion, too many are found to take them at their word.

“No doubt it is a prevailing idea, that the doctrine of immaterialism is essential as a foundation for that of future retribution. Rightly to discuss this question might need half a volume. Here it might suffice broadly to protest against basing such a doctrine on physical subtleties. The experience of the old Platonists and other schools which committed this error, might sufficiently warn us against it. A man who believed his soul to be immortal, because it was an unchangeable atom in which his self consisted, was irresistibly carried to believe his *past* as well as his *future* immortality, and therefore lost all idea of ‘person’ in connection with his soul. As Archbishop Whately states it:—‘They believed, not their souls but the substance of their souls to be immortal’; and personality being dropped, Pantheism crept in, which was nothing but veiled materialism in its most objectional form. Equally clear is it, that the immortality of the low-

est brutes,—a limpet or a fly—perhaps even that of the souls of vegetables, follows from the same reasoning; as may be seen indeed in Butler's Analogy; and all moral import in a future state becomes more than problematical. But the very basis of the theory is in direct collision with notorious fact. It is pretended the soul is unchangeable, when we have all the proof possible that *it changes from day to day*, and nothing but hardy denial on the other side. And if it be ever so immaterial, it still remains, that what *had its beginning at birth may have its end at death*.

“One other ground of fear from materialism derives too much countenance from a prevailing doctrine of Phrenologists. It is supposed that a materialist must of course be a Necessarian, and must deny that men cannot be justly praised or blamed, rewarded or punished. We know that a necessarian may with logical consistency hold that it is right to punish a man, as we would whip a dog, merely because experience shows the efficacy of the motive; but altho' this satisfies the lower demands of economies, it by no means meets what we believe spiritual religion and sound morality to require. . . . We cannot ourselves see any proper connection between materialism and the doctrine of necessity. The latter controversy is notoriously an entangled one. *Spiritual Fatalists* are not at all rare among contemplative and even devout persons; and as far as we can see, the difficulties in the way of believing in human free-agency are equally great, and need to be met by the very same considerations, in the immaterialist as in the materialist theory. No materialist has any right to argue, that as a planet moves without power of self-control, so also must the human brain, if its forces are merely material ones. For the pretended analogy would quite as well prove that it cannot hope and desire, meditate and reflect, as that it cannot act freely upon itself. Into such false analogies those are perhaps peculiarly apt to fall, who have studied inanimate, more than animate or rational nature; and it is hardly fair to charge on materialism, *as such*, the errors which arise out of an undue encroachment of physiology on the domain of morals.”—*Prospective Review*, March, 1845.

—0—

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE FACTS AND PHENOMENA OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

(Continued from page 148.)

An important part of the scriptural evidence against the popular doctrine of the Cross is furnished in the *facts and phenomena* of the death of Christ. The intelligent and candid reader will acknowledge that if the current opinions on the subject are correct, they will appear to be borne out by all the circumstances connected with our Lord's last sufferings and death. Here, however, we discover the most conflicting phenomena,—conflicting, that is, with the opinions usually held as to the doctrinal significance of this solemn fact in our Lord's history. Every attempt to interpret the events which cluster around the Cross of the crucified Jesus, on the recognized principles of the popular theology, involves us in strange and painful confusion. The

attitude of the suffering and dying Christ as set forth in the Gospels exhibits nothing in common with his alleged attitude as the *substitute* for sinners, bearing vicariously their punishment, and drinking the bitter dregs of Divine wrath. We see, indeed, marvellous anguish there, but it does not seem as if it were the result of Divine wrath.—That those sufferings were of the nature of a *judicial satisfaction*, demanded by the justice of God, and only completed when “Jesus cried with a loud voice and expired,” appears to us a notion so clearly at variance with the historic phenomena of the case, that we only wonder that ourselves and others should have been so long blind to its obvious disharmony with the Gospel record. As to the process of proof usually adopted by the learned defenders of the popular doctrine, we do not think that we speak only our own experience when we say, that it always struck us as rather perplexingly profound than plain and palpable. Candor obliges us to confess that we received these theological theorizings not so much because we were convinced, but because we were constrained by the popular conscience and the prestige of orthodoxy to accept them as true. And possibly had we never been called upon to publicly defend the popular faith, we might have remained to this day as thoroughly “orthodox” as any of our brethren. We are thankful that even at some painful cost, we have learnt ‘a more excellent way’—that our faith in popular infallibilities has been entirely shaken and destroyed, and that we have at last learnt that true godly allegiance to truth which obliges us to appeal first and last to the law and to the testimony for the rule of our faith and the guide of our life. As we have so often said, this is the oracle of our orthodoxy.—To its teachings we make our supreme and final appeal, and by its decisions only we stand or fall.

Opening our oracle, then, we turn to that solemn page which informs us that Jesus knowing his “hour” was come, said to his disciples who had been partaking with him of the last supper, “Arise, let us go hence.” Towards Gethsemane they direct their way,—a spot consecrated as the loved resort of Jesus and his disciples for its retirement, and where, removed from the cares and numerous interruptions of the city, they often had passed together many a holy and happy hour. Here once more and for the last time they come, and Jesus bids his disciples remain behind, with the exception of Peter, James, and John, and prepare for the approaching trial by seeking counsel and strength from God. To these chosen three Jesus discloses the depth of his sorrows—a sorrow “even unto death.” “Tarry ye here,” he says, “and watch with me.” To them is entrusted the painful duty of guarding their Lord's retirement, and giving him notice of any hostile intrusion. He himself “went a little further,” and there overwhelmed with sorrow, “he fell on his face,” and prays that if possible he may be saved from that hour. “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me! nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.” “Being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly;” thrice did he cry to be delivered, “and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.”*

* “Dr. Mead, from Galen, observes, cases sometimes happen in which, through mental pressure, the pores may be so dilated that the blood may issue from

Now here is a phenomenon which it becomes us to look upon with trembling awe, and to write of with the most cautious reverence. Many have speculated on this solemn significance, and have attempted to unravel the mysterious emotions of that terrible hour. It is not our purpose to undertake any such task, but rather to confront that theory of this season of sorrow which has obtained the ascendancy, and arrogated to itself the claim of being exclusively orthodox, with other accompanying phenomena which the sacred history develops. That theory we have often indicated. Suffice it here to remark, that it ascribes the Savior's intense anguish in Gethsemane to the alleged fact that, by a fiction of law, he stood in the place of a world of sinners lying under the wrathful displeasure of God, and exposed to an eternity of miserable torment in hell. He was enduring then the first bitter pangs of the punishment of sin, and writhing under the first mighty pressure of infinite wrath. The "cup" which he so earnestly prayed might if possible pass from him, was the cup of Divine indignation, we are told, put into his hand by the Omnipotent Avenger of sin, and which he was made to drink even to the dregs. It was then that the inexorable law was taking its terrible course—justice exacting its sanguinary satisfaction,—“the concentration of the sufferings of the atonement”* as a popular commentator writes, “pouring together upon him, and filling him with unspeakable anguish.” From this representation our moral judgment revolts—and our understanding, in the view simply of the historic phenomena of our Lord's sufferings and death, withholds its assent.

How, we ask, in the view of that fact “*there appeared an angel from heaven, strengthening him*,” can we accept this popular explanation of the agony in the garden? Whence came this angel? “From heaven.” For what purpose? To give consolation and strength to the exhausted sufferer. Now either he came on his own account, moved by sympathetic impulses, or he came at the bidding of God. One or other was the cause of this Angelic mission.—But if the suffering Jesus was then in the eye of God but as the concentration of a world's pollution and guilt—if at that moment he was the impersonation of all sinners, and in that assumed character was an object of Divine loathing and indignation, deserving and receiving the dreadful penalty due to their sins, what sympathy could a holy and obedient angel of heaven be conscious of towards him, much

them; so that there may be a bloody sweat.” And Bishop Pearce gives an instance from *Thucydides* of an Italian gentleman being so distressed with the fear of death, that his body was covered with a bloody sweat.—*Dr. Adam Clarke.*

Dr. Doddridge says, (Note on Luke xxii. 44.) that “Aristotle and Diodorus Siculus both mention bloody sweats as attending some extraordinary agony of mind; and I find that Loti, in his life of Pope Sixtus V., and Sir John Chardin, in his history of Persia, mentioning a like phenomenon.”

Olshausen in his Commentary on this passage, thinks the force of Luke's language requires us to understand that “a comparison only of the sweat with drops of blood” is intended, and not that there were “identical drops of blood.” “His sweat was as it were great drops of blood,” &c.—Vol. 4, p. 182.

* *Barnes.*—For the scriptural meaning of the word *Atonement*, see pages 79–81 of the present volume of the “Christian Examiner.”

less practically express? Nor, under these alleged circumstances, is it conceivable that God could have sent one of his “ministering spirits” to Christ, whose peculiar sonship was for the time being set aside for judicial purposes, and who stood before him in none other than a representative and criminal character. In the view of God, Jesus was *then* not his immaculate Son, in whom he was well pleased, but the impersonation of a guilty and doomed humanity, against whom his anger was kindled, and whom he was about representatively to punish. Inasmuch as God could not give consolation and strength to sinners themselves, when left to the endurance of their condign punishment; he could not so minister to one who is supposed to have been their substitute. And yet, says the record, “there appeared an angel from heaven strengthening him.” Here is a clearly revealed historic fact which we invite our readers to confront with these so-called “Evangelical” doctrines. The fact will not be disputed; then the theology of the popular churches *must* be disputed, for there is most obvious contrast and discordance here. If it be a *fact* that an angel from heaven ministered strength and consolation to Jesus during his agony in Gethsemane, then that system of doctrine which we have described, and which the popular churches endorse, must be a notorious and most mischievous *fiction*.

The explanation of our Lord's agony on this occasion seems to be furnished by an apostle. Writing of this sorrow “even unto death” Paul says, “Who (viz. Christ) in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to *save him from death*.” We shall speak more particularly on this subject as we proceed. No doubt our Lord's dread of death was one chief cause of his anguish, for it should be remembered that death to him was not what it is, or can be to ordinary human beings. But it is probable that there were other elements of grief besides a natural sympathy with his own prospective sufferings. The guilt of the Jewish people in their deliberate rejection of him, and in being about to imbrue their hands in the blood of one who came in the name, and as the representative of God, no doubt pressed heavily on his loving heart. It was not exclusively a sympathy with himself, we may well imagine, that prostrated his soul in anguish. When from the summit of Olivet he looked on the devoted city, and wept over it—when on his way to Calvary, bearing the burden of his own cross, he looked around on the weepers, and bade them weep rather for themselves than for him, we see such a wonderful forgetfulness of self that it is reasonable to suppose that similar feelings were agitating his bosom at this time.—But whether we can, or cannot explain the nature and causes of this mental agony, is not of much importance to our present inquiry; it is sufficient that the circumstances of the case forbid us to accept as the true explanation that offensive theory which is now so generally received.

The language of Christ to the weeping multitude who followed bewailing him is deserving our attention while examining the incidents of this memorable tragedy. The language is not without significance in its aspect towards our present inquiry. “Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.”—We have said that this was the language of loving

sympathy. There is nothing of unfeeling harshness here, as if our Lord was then taunting them with the woes which the national guilt of crucifying him was about to bring upon them. These were genuine sympathizers with his sufferings who attracted his notice on this occasion, and it was not the wont of Jesus harshly to repulse any, much less such as these. But why should Jesus bid these weeping ones dry their tears under circumstances so truly extraordinary as the popular faith represents? If Christ were then on his way to expiate a world's guilt by bearing the desert of a world's punishment, was there not the most abundant reason why tears should flow—scalding tears—tears of blood, if that were possible? “Daughters of Jerusalem,” we should rather have expected to hear Christ say, “well may ye weep, for behold the hour of expiation is at hand, and I your substitute and that of the whole world am now going to bear the mighty burden of an infinite punishment which your, and the world's sins have brought upon me. Weep on, daughters of Jerusalem, for great indeed is your guilt which needs so great and fearful an expiation.” But not so. “Weep not for me” is the singularly strange bidding!

Yet, further, Christ declares to these weeping women that they had more cause to weep *for themselves* than for him, and for the reason that they were about to undergo all the horrors of a sanguinary invasion, in which their city should be taken and destroyed. “Behold the days are coming in which they shall say, Blessed are the barren and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck. Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, fall on us; and to the hills, cover us. For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in a dry?” Viewed aright, this language exhibits a beautiful illustration of the benevolence and unselfishness of Christ's heart—but how can we understand it, on the supposition that Christ was then on his way to the endurance of a substitutionary and infinite punishment? Our Lord compares his own sufferings with those which they would shortly endure, and he tells them to reserve their tears for themselves, for his sufferings were light in comparison with what awaited them. But what are the horrors of even the worst conceivable siege—its famishings, its desolations of fire, and sword, and pestilence, and the constant apprehension of a terrible death; compared with those inexpressible agonies which we are assured that Christ, as the substitute for sinners, had to endure? Language fails to furnish expression for the horror of this *expiatory* crucifixion. Thought is overpowered by the very effort to conceive the dreadful nature of Christ's *vicarious* sufferings. Does it not, then, seem strange,—unaccountably strange, that Christ should compare his unique and indescribable woe, with that which awaited the Jewish people in their national overthrow, and declare that the sufferings of that national catastrophe would be even *beyond his own*? His,—

“A weight of woe, more than whole worlds could bear,”

lighter and less to be lamented than the woes which the people of Judah would endure in the siege and capture of their city!! Here again we meet with singular inconsistency in examining the phenomena of the Sacred History by the light of popular opinion. That the Lord Jesus should have bidden the

daughters of Jerusalem not to weep for him, but rather weep for themselves, as exposed to more terrible calamities than he was about to suffer, is a standing protest against the monstrous construction which is put on the last sufferings of Christ by the dominant theology. Were those sufferings of the nature they are declared to have been, there can be no doubt but that all the circumstances of that awful occasion would have contributed to give them that appearance. Their expiatory character, had such been their character, would by the manner and circumstances of their endurance have stood out in prominent relief, and nothing would have occurred, and especially nothing would be said or done by our Lord which would be adapted even to conceal so important a significance, much less to contradict it. But here, in the phenomena of the last sufferings of Christ, is nothing to be discovered which could make it possible for the actual spectators of them, or ourselves, who read the history from the pens of eye-witnesses, to know that they had any such significance as the popular theology declares they had; but on the other hand very much is to be met with, as we shall have further occasion to show, which obliges us to reject that system of doctrine as having no foundation in, and no harmony with the Sacred History.

(To be Continued.)

“BOOKED FOR HELL.”

BRO. STORRS:—I am still looking for, and loving the appearing of Christ who is our LIFE. I can assure you that I am not a careless spectator of the conflict that is being waged concerning the glorious topic of Immortality as revealed in the gospel. It is but little that I can do in the cause, yet I would not leave that little undone.

One thing is certain, that the Life question is assuming a greater importance with the passing of every day. Opposers of the doctrine have learned what a few years since many of them were ignorant of, namely, that there is *such a doctrine preached and believed*. Their abortive attempts to meet, or rather to *evade* the true issue, can only be accounted for by recollecting the influences of early prejudice, and the pressure of earthly motives.

Some of them seem to make use of railings, instead of reasons—sneers instead of sense—anathemas instead of arguments. They are welcome to the honor of such a course. *Some* men are not thus deterred from making use of their eyes, ears, and brains. Candidly, we want something else.—When men rail, the reason is presumed to be, because they have no better arguments. When men can only stand and cry “infidelity,” “heresy,” “unscriptural doctrine,” &c., when *they know* that we believe the Bible *as firmly* and *as fully*, to say the least, as they do; when *they know* that we can read the doctrine out of the Bible, and the only way they can prevent its being done, is by refusing to hear us *read God's Word*, (as they have repeatedly done at church trials;) to have them take such a course as this, and then stand back upon their dignity and infallibility and deliberately doom us to perdition, seems the extreme stretch of impudence, to say nothing of its sin.

Do they do this? There is a man connected

with the New England Methodist Episcopal Conference, as a preacher, named J. D. B. He is esteemed as one of the *leading* preachers in that Conference. (Lord have mercy on those that are *led*.) Well, about the last of August, the Methodists had a camp-meeting at Southampton, Mass. Thursday afternoon, if I recollect rightly, this man undertook to preach from Phil. 1: 28—"And in nothing terrified by your adversaries," &c. He went on to show who the adversaries of the M. E. Church were, and went over with a list of atheists, infidels, Universalists, spirit rappers, &c., and at the conclusion of each head would say—"I book them for hell!" At length he pounced upon the believers in "life and death," as revealed in the gospel, and after calling them "soul-sleepers," "annihilationists," and other interesting names, he said, "*Book them for hell!*" And I am informed that he intimated something about sending them there by the *first conveyance*. Thus he went on waxing exceedingly zealous, and thinking, no doubt, that his pious "wrath" was working "the righteousness of God." So it did, for the ultimate effect was exceedingly salutary.

Said one Methodist brother, who is interested in the Life question, "I agreed with the preacher in *one thing*. When he commenced to preach, he said, he presumed that his sermon would be called by some the *ugliest sermon they ever heard*. I agreed with him *perfectly* there; *it was so*."

A few reflections are suggested by such kind of talk as this of the Rev. J. D. B.

1. I think this man had forgotten what belonged to common courtesy: and especially to the character of the Christian ministry. "The servant of God *must not strive*." He must "be *patient towards all men*," and "in meekness instruct" (not insult,) "them that oppose themselves, that peradventure God may" (not "book them for hell!" but) "give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." We read of a no less personage than Michael, who once contended with the *very devil himself*, and yet *durst not bring a railing accusation against him*. One would think that some of the modern guardians of *pagan tradition and heathen fables* had become possessed with the idea, either that *they* are a great deal *better than Michael*, or else that *we* are much *worse than the devil*, and so they seem to imagine that they may *rail* to their hearts' content.

2. I think that this man has not studied his *text* very closely in English or Greek, for if he had he might have seen that the word *apoleia*, perdition, means DESTRUCTION, RUIN, STATE OF BEING DESTROYED, and contains within itself (aside from twenty-five other passages in Paul's epistles that teach the same doctrine,) enough to overthrow his *pagan notion of eternal torment*. By the way, last Sunday evening I preached about two hours on a series of passages which were sent me by an unknown person, whose 'nest,' *perhaps*, had been a little 'stirred' by the "Scripture searchers." Well, in giving, as I supposed, *all the passages* he could find to sustain *eternal torment*, he could only find *one* in all Paul's *fourteen epistles* which he *dared to quote*, and that was, "Who shall be punished with everlasting DESTRUCTION." "Blindness in part, has happened unto" *Methodists*. But to return.

3. I thought J. D. B. a little unmerciful, to "book" us "for hell"—there to be *tormented, tortured, agonize, writhe, wail, blaspheme God, and suffer millions of years of inconceivable anguish for each and every heretical thought and word and deed*, and yet when *this was past* have all our *sufferings* but *just begun, and never to end*, and all this because we believe GOD MEANS JUST WHAT HE SAYS, and are willing to forsake, for his truth, *snug parsonages, fat salaries*, or, as Rev. J. D. B. might express it, "*desirable appointments*." Now is it not a little *too bad*? And then to be in such a hurry—the 'first' 'boat,' or 'stage,' or 'train:' must you have us tormented before the time?

4. Then I thought, "Perhaps after all his talk, he don't think hell is such a terrible affair! Perhaps it is only the same to him as being out of the M. E. Church! for certainly if he 'was orthodox on this point, he wouldn't 'book' men off so unceremoniously. And further—do you suppose that a whole stand full of *preachers* would have set behind him *laughing*, and a host of people would have sat before him doing the same, if they hadn't thought he was only in fun? May be he was trying to *mimic* the old Pope Leo X., who decreed that the *soul was immortal*—and "condemned all such as taught that the soul was mortal;" and perhaps the people were laughing to see how nicely he carried it out!!

5. I thought perhaps the poor man was *provoked to it* by some who had *pestered and bothered* him with *passages of God's Word* till he was out of all patience, and hoped to get rid of them, as the Pope did of heretics, or as a backwoodsman would of *musketoes* by kindling a FIRE.

Ah, well, Bro. B., this is but "the beginning of sorrows"—and if the "whips" gall you so, I don't know how you will bear the "scorpions."

The *truth* is destined to *spread*, and be it known unto you, that *that sermon* did more to *spread it* in the immediate vicinity of that camp-meeting than any other that has been preached for a long while.

Perhaps you do not know that a number of your brethren in "good and regular standing in the M. E. Church," got together the following Sunday night in the school-house at Westfield Farms, and in the midst of the best meeting they have had, some of them, for fifteen years, concluded that after all they guessed they wasn't "booked for hell," and they preferred going *somewhere else*—especially as *some of them* had *serious doubts* whether there really was any just such hell as you talked of.

6. I thought I wouldn't feel at all cross or hard toward Bro. B., for it may be he will be in a better mood at another time, and who knows but he may yet preach, that "God only hath immortality?" and if he does not, I shall not judge him, but shall hope to meet him in the better land where we shall *know* a great deal *more*, and do a great deal *better* than here.

7. I thought it wouldn't make much difference whether he booked us for *heaven or hell*. I doubt whether he is an authorized book-keeper for the *former place*, indeed I don't know as he professed to book any one for *heaven* at all. Perhaps his business lay chiefly in another direction.

8. I thought that "the Word of God is not bound; and" *further, it never will be*; and men had

better be careful how they oppose its march.—‘Potsherd’s may do to fight with ‘potsherd’s,’ but when they claim *immortality*, and assume the *attributes of the Creator*, they show their own weakness and contemptibility. This last thought was forcibly impressed upon my mind when I was in Springfield Depot, and saw a little *yellow dog* running and barking after a huge locomotive, which was trundling away its ponderous load just as if there wasn’t a single *yellow dog* under the whole heavens.

If you judge these thoughts worthy of examination, put them in your valuable Examiner.

Plymouth, Mass., 1853.

H. L. H.

EXCERPTS.

BRO. STORRS:—I am pleased with the manner in which, in the June *Examiner*, you dispose of the *Northern Advocate*, as well as the use you have made of the paragraph relating to Dr. Dick. My continued investigations on the *Life and Death* question satisfy me not only that our views are in harmony with the whole tenor of the Bible, but that they will also stand the test of the most enlightened criticism.

Prof. Geo. Bush, in his “Notes on Genesis,” after expressing his belief that “*living soul*” means the same in Gen. 2: 7, that it does in other places when applied to beasts, says: “As to the intellectual faculties which raise man so far above the tribes of the brute creation, we find no term that expressly designates them in any part of the sacred narrative. * * * * *

Indeed, it may be remarked that the Scriptures generally afford much less *explicit* proof of the existence of a sentient immaterial principle in man, capable of living and acting separate from the body, than is usually supposed.”

Such testimony on this point should, it seems to me, excite the suspicion in “orthodox” minds that the *future life* of man may, after all, depend upon a *resurrection from the dead*.

Prof. Bush, speaking of some of the “blemishes” of “the received version” of the Bible, says—“Of these, by far the most prominent is a want of *uniformity* in the mode of rendering, both in regard to single words and to phrases.” In what way this “blemish” has served to hide the truth in relation to the *nature of man, the state of the dead, and the doom of the wicked*, is clearly and fully brought out in “*Bible vs. Tradition*,” where the meaning of *nephesh, ruah, psuche, pneuma, sheol, hades, gehenna*, and other terms and phrases are set forth.

A recent work, entitled, “*The Methodist Preacher*,” has a sermon, by your old friend ORANGE SCOTT, on the “*Immortality of the Soul*.” I have copied one paragraph and here give it:—

“There are certain persons, of whom it is said, that they shall never see death. ‘He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me, shall never die.’ ‘If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever.’ ‘Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my word, he shall never see death.’—From hence it appears that by performing certain conditions, men may ‘live for ever.’ But none are exempt from the death of the body. It is, there-

fore, the soul that shall not die. We are not, however, to infer from this, that the wicked shall be annihilated: but only, that they shall experience a death from which the righteous are exempt.”

I am astonished that such a paragraph should be admitted into a Methodist work, for if it proves any thing, it proves that *Immortality* is to be received only through Christ. But, then, I am reminded that O. SCOTT abandoned the endless misery theory before he died. I regret that he did not do so before he wrote the sermon in question.

Have you seen Hiram Mattison’s work on “*Spirit Rappings*?” I have examined but one chapter—that devoted to the “*Intermediate State*,”—and I find he denies that Moses appeared at the transfiguration as a *disembodied spirit*, contending that he was *raised from the dead*. This is a good position against the *rappers*, and it deprives our *double-entity* friends of one of their strongholds.—The same view, I observe, is advanced in a sermon (by Rev. G. G. Hapgood,) on the *Resurrection*, in a work, published a few years since, called “*The Methodist Episcopal Pulpit*.”

Canajoharie, N. Y.

RUFUS WENDELL.

“WHERE THEIR WORM DIETH NOT,” &c.

Mark 9: 48.

RICHARD WATSON, in his exposition of the above passage, says—“As the worm itself dies not, but *destroys* that it feeds upon, and as a fire unquenched *consumes* that upon which it kindles, so when temporal judgments are expressed by this phrase, the *utter destruction* of persons, cities, and nations, appears to be intended; but when it refers to a future state, and the subject of the punishment is, in itself, or by Divine appointment, immortal, the idea is heightened to its utmost terror; *their worm* of remorse and reflection ever gnaws; and *the fire*, which represents the severity of accumulated judgments, is never quenched.”

We may learn, from this exposition, in what way those passages which clearly teach the “*utter destruction*” of the ungodly are pressed into the service of the *endless misery* theory. This is done by *assuming* the *unconditional immortality* of all men. The *undying worm* and *unquenchable fire* are not, it will be observed, deemed inappropriate symbols of “*utter destruction*,” when “*temporal*” judgments are intended; but when they are applied to *future punishment*, we are required to receive them in a sense that bears not the slightest analogy to their original import! The necessity for this violent interpretation vanishes when we come to regard man, agreeably with the uniform testimony of God’s Word, as a probationer for an endless existence. Then it becomes apparent that “*utter destruction*” *must* be the doom of the finally impenitent. “They shall,” says an apostle, “*utterly perish* in their own corruption.” In what will this differ from the “*utter destruction*” of which Mr. Watson speaks?

R. WENDELL.

Canajoharie, N. Y., Aug. 25, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1853.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—One more number completes this volume. We shall act as heretofore, viz.—*Discontinue* sending the Examiner to all persons who have *not paid in advance* for the next volume. Those, therefore, who do not receive the paper for January, 1854, will know the reason is, that we have not received payment according to our terms. If any think themselves entitled to it, let them inform us, stating the circumstances, and we will make it right.

Soon as we have issued the Dec. number, we shall have the volumes for 1852 and 1853 bound in one volume. Those who wish for it in that form will please let us know soon, as we can supply only a limited number of copies. The price will be \$1.50.

We can supply a few copies of the Examiner, *in sheets*, for '49, '50, '51, and '52. Price, 50 cents for each of those years.

The proposition for next year is as follows:

1. If we receive one thousand dollars by Dec. 25th, from subscribers or otherwise, we will publish the Examiner *twice* each month at \$1 per year.

2. Or, if fifteen hundred *paying* subscribers are secured by January first, at \$2 per year, then we will publish it *weekly*.

3. If neither of the previous propositions are met, then we shall go on *monthly* as heretofore; but any person who pays \$1, prior to Dec. 25th, shall be entitled to a copy of Br. Blain's new work—*"Death not Life,"*—without charge; they paying the postage. This offer applies only in case of the Examiner being published *monthly*.

A RESPONSE FROM DR. McCULLOH

Baltimore, Md., Sep., 1853.

MR. GEORGE STORRS,—*Dear Sir:*—I have just received the October number of the Bible Examiner, and am gratified to find the prospect so good of extending the simple truths of the Gospel, by making it the interpreter of itself, and not in conceding any thing to the authority of men.

To help you towards publishing your periodical twice a month, I forward you ten dollars.

With all good wishes to you,

I am, &c.,

J. H. McCULLOH.

Dr. McCulloh will accept our thanks; and, also,

Jacob Grim, of Philadelphia, from whom we have received eleven dollars for the same object.

ED. OF EX.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work still continues to be called for, and we have just issued the "*Third Edition*." Let it be sent into every corner of the land: it is a thorough cure for the natural immortality theory; and shows beyond a reasonable doubt that Life and Immortality are the gift of God through Jesus Christ *alone*, and by the resurrection at the last day.

Price, 75 cents. For \$5, ten copies. Sent in all cases at the expense of the purchaser, except where \$1 is sent for one copy, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's Works, then we pay the postage.

"DEATH NOT LIFE."—This work, also, has had a rapid sale; thirteen hundred copies having been disposed of in two months. Another edition is now issued. Let it be placed in every neighborhood; it will open eyes to see the deception that has been practiced to conceal the fact that the doctrine of *endless misery* is not taught in the Bible, but is a pure fiction, invented by men. Price, 25 cents; or six copies for one dollar. Postage to be paid by the purchaser.

Both of the forenamed works should be scattered by tens of thousands; let it be done.

"PAULINE THEOLOGY; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul*." By H. L. Hastings, Plymouth, Mass." A neat pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo. A valuable work. For sale at the Bible Examiner Office, 140 Fulton-street, N. Y. Price, 10 cents. Also for sale at 26 State-st., Hartford, Conn., Second Advent Watchman office, and by the Author. It should be put into every house in the land.

VISIT TO DANSVILLE.—We were absent from New York city nine days—traveled seven hundred miles, and preached twelve times. Our meeting was well attended by an intelligent class of people. The weather was fine and mild; and we had a most delightful interview with the brethren. Truly it was good to be there. The truth is clearly advancing in that region.

Br. Wm. Brown's house was our resting place whilst at Dansville; and we felt much at home in his kind family.

We met our fellow-laborer, C. F. Sweet, there, and was much interested and pleased with our interview. He now goes out under the patronage of the Prov. Com. May the Lord abundantly bless

him in his labors. Others in that region, we trust, will soon launch forth into the work.

The friends at Dansville will accept our thanks for their liberality in helping us on our way. They also subscribed some thirty dollars for the *Prov. Com.*, through Br. Blain, who was present with us part of the time.

—o—

PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.

We have thought best to republish, from the March Examiner, the first notice of this Committee and its object. It is as follows:—

“PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.—A few of us have assumed this name, with the determination to search out laborers, and proffer them *help* in the field of their labors, to scatter light on the *Life theme*. The spread of light on this subject is our *only* object. This we state frankly; not that we desire to restrict the laborers so that they will not feel themselves free on other topics; but this theme is the one upon which we shall aim to give light; and we now call upon all who love it to lend us a helping hand, by contributing to the funds, and by your counsel and prayers. We believe the time has come that God expects us all to show more fully our faith by our works. The *living voice* must be heard proclaiming *Life* in the name of Jesus *alone*; and those who make the proclamation must be sustained. Let all who have a willing mind send funds to the Provisionary Committee, in New York, or raise such a Committee in their own town or county, and act at once in this matter.

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,	} <i>Prov.</i>
HENRY F. JOHNSON,	
GEORGE STORRS.	

New York, March, 1st, 1853.”

The object thus expressed last March is still *the* object.

The Preachers laboring in the *Life Theme*, on the ground proposed by the *Prov. Com.*, and under its patronage, are the following, viz:

C. M. RICHMOND, of Peru, Ind., in Central Indiana.

JACOB BLAIN, of Buffalo, N. Y., in Western New York.

W. S. CAMPBELL, of Chester Factories, Mass., in Western Mass. and Eastern N. Y.

J. S. WHITE, of Worcester, Mass., in Massachusetts.

T. GARBUTT, of Orangeport, N. Y., in the counties in that vicinity.

C. F. SWEET, of Ulster, Pa., in Northern Pa., and Southern N. Y.

Others will be added to the list as fast as approved men can be found who are willing to go to the

work. We have hesitated, hitherto, in soliciting preaching brethren to engage under the patronage of the *Prov. Com.*, fearing that we might disappoint them in relation to the pecuniary assistance which we know they need, and ought to have. Each man, who has a family, certainly *ought* to receive about \$300 per year, if he is devoting his whole time to the work. The Committee think that a *small* sum; and there should be added to it *necessary* traveling expenses. We wish to do every thing in this matter *openly*: we have no *private* designs or object. No one of our Committee charge or receive any thing for our services in this matter. All the money contributed to the *Com.* is applied to sustain the Preachers who go out under its patronage; and the application of it will be stated from time to time in the Examiner, so that all can judge for themselves whether their offerings have been properly applied.

Shall these men be sustained, who go forth bearing the precious seed of Life Eternal? Has God given any of us this world's goods to hoard up, while men of God are laboring to spread the truth, asking only that they may have sufficient to keep them and their families from actual want? Brethren and friends, let us ask ourselves whether we do not owe a debt of gratitude to God for the light He has granted us; and whether we are not bound to repay that debt by contributing to scatter the same light to those persons who are still bound in the miserable chains of superstition, which so long afflicted and tormented ourselves?

The *Prov. Com.* are not anxious that you should make them the *distributors* of your bounty. We would prefer that in every county the friends should have a *Prov. Com.* to receive and pay over to some preacher or preachers, in whom they have confidence, all that they may be able to collect. But if they prefer that we should receive and distribute their bounty, we are willing to do so according to our best judgment: yet, if any choose to designate to what preacher, in particular, they will have their money applied, it will be so applied; or if they wish it should be applied to publish works on the *Life Theme*, for *gratuitous* distribution, it shall be so done. We wish every one's bounty applied so as to meet the approval of the donor.

Now is the time to come up, with renewed zeal, to the help of the Lord in publishing *Life only* through Christ; and the *Prov. Com.* have ventured to encourage several more Preachers to launch forth in the work, believing that the hearts of the lovers of the glorious truth we promulgate will be opened to help these men of God. Shall we be disappointed? We trust not. Say at once, friends, what you will do in the matter. Send your bounty

direct to "*Geo. Storrs, New York,*" or pay it to either of the Preachers whose names we have given you above. In acknowledging money paid, the name of the individual donor will not appear in the Examiner—unless it is necessary for satisfaction as to the fact that it is received—but the *amount* only. We wish nothing done for *show*, or through emulation. Let us work for God and his Christ, and wait till the resurrection of the just for our reward.

GEO. STORRS, *for the Prov. Com.*
New York, Nov. 1, 1853.

RECEIPTS BY PROV. COM.

Acknowledged previous to October,	\$142.65
During the month of Oct., as follows:—	
By Br. Blain, from friends in Lockport, N. Y.	5.00
“ “ “ Buffalo, “	5.00
“ “ “ Honeoye, “	16.00
“ “ “ Fredonia, “	8.00
“ “ “ Dansville, “	6.00
“ “ “ A friend, E. Springwater, “	2.00
By Br. C. M. Richmond, from friends in La Fayette, Ind.	9.00
Total receipts, to Nov. 1st,	\$193.65

DISBURSEMENTS BY PROV. COM., TO NOV. 1st.

To Br. C. M. Richmond, - - - -	\$115.40
To Br. J. Blain, - - - -	42.00
To Br. C. F. Sweet, - - - -	20.00
To Br. Thomas Garbutt, - - - -	20.00
For Tracts distributed by C. M. Richmond,	4.37
Total disbursements, - - - -	\$201.77

Treasury overdrawn, - - - - \$8.12
GEO. STORRS, *Treasurer for Pro. Com.*

P. S. Bro. Blain has obtained some \$100 in *pledges*, besides the above amount paid in. All this he has done in about six weeks.

BR. C. M. RICHMOND.—In September, this brother visited Ohio, to attend a "Family Convention" at his father's house: a convention at which all the children and grand-children are expected to be present. His father is a Preacher, (Baptist, we suppose,) and has *three sons*, who are preachers. At these conventions—which are *Triennial*, we believe—the father preaches a sermon, and each of his sons also. Br. Richmond must have had a trial to stand his ground on this occasion; but it seems God enabled him to testify for the truth. He thus speaks of it:—

The *Family Convention* is closed. I had the privilege, on the Sabbath, of presenting the truth on the penalty of God's law, to a large and attentive congregation. Of course it gave offence to some; for the time is come when men will not endure sound doctrine. After preaching many called upon me for publications. Some declared that they were convinced that the wicked would cease to exist.

My dear brother, I am bound up in the work of preaching the glorious Truth. I cannot refrain.—The light shines so clear upon my own mind, and the orthodox system seems so unscriptural and absurd, that I *must preach the whole truth* with all the ability God has given me. It is really painful to be obliged to leave awakened inquirers and pass on to other fields of labor, and know that all the bigotry and ingenuity of orthodoxy will exert themselves to extinguish, or befog the ways of truth.—But God is on the side of truth, and it will and must prevail. Your brother in Christ,
Sheffield, Ohio. C. M. RICHMOND.

The foregoing was received too late for our last, and we now give the following along with it.

BRO. STORRS:—On my return to this place I spent a Sabbath at Fort Wayne. The truth on life and death, was presented in the afternoon and evening. At night the Court House was full.—Many were disposed to receive the truth. Unfortunately I had scarcely any publications with me, for they were, in many cases, earnestly desired. I was solicited to visit them again, which I shall endeavor to do soon. In that city, as in other places, the strongest opposition, and the most bitter and bigoted spirit was manifested by leading professors of religion. I will give an instance. After I had presented the Bible doctrine, of the constitution and destiny of man, and dismissed the congregation, a prominent Methodist stepped forward, and insultingly asked, "*How long, sir, have you been a missionary of the Devil?*" and indulged in other abusive and uncourteous language. But the "spirit he was of" was manifest to all, and fully appreciated. Soon after this occurrence, two gentlemen, (and not professors of religion,) called upon me and apologized for the rudeness of their fellow-citizen, to a stranger who was peaceably presenting Bible Truth, as he understood it, to the people.

I am now laboring in different localities in this county. I was recently visited by an old Baptist minister, who earnestly exhorted me *not to discuss nor preach* on the state of the dead, and penalty of the law! "But none of these things move me." I am happy to say that the discussion in the "*Sentinel*," is doing, without doubt, a good work. The Truth is still onward in this part of the State.
C. M. RICHMOND.

Peru, Ind., Oct. 13, 1853.

THE WHOLE TRUTH.

The whole truth given to man in the Bible for his benefit and salvation, is comprehended under four heads:

- 1st. Man as *he was* in his origin and condition before the fall.
 - 2nd. Man as *he is* in his present state since the fall.
 - 3rd. Man as *he will be* in his future state and final condition.
 - 4th. *The means* or conditions *by which* his future state will be settled or determined.
- My purpose is, wherever I go, to speak on some

part of this whole truth, as I understand it—looking for Eternal Life *only* through Jesus Christ our Lord.

J. S. WHITE.

—o—
SPIRIT RAPPINGS.—The *New York Daily Times*, of Oct. 20th, in speaking of Judge EDMONDS, who has recently published a work in defence of Spirit Rapping, says:—

“Judge EDMONDS is guilty of the folly of saying that *the doctrine* of the Soul’s Immortality is now, for the first time, put beyond a doubt. We have read his book with all reasonable care; and we defy Judge EDMONDS to point out, in these pretended revelations of BACON, SWEDENBORG, and the rest, a single thought or *doctrine* now for the first time revealed, or adding any substantial or useful knowledge.”

The *Times* adds:—

“Throughout this farrago of revelation there is one thread which unites them into a systematic whole—and that is their steady hostility to the essential elements of Christianity, * * * *every distinctive article of the Christian faith is negatived by these pretended revelations.*”

The italicising in this extract is ours. If our neighbor of the *Times* is correct in this last statement—and we think he is—then “*the doctrine of the Soul’s Immortality*” is *not* an “*article of the Christian faith*,” for, “this farrago of revelations” does *not* “*negate*” that doctrine, but *affirms* it, and makes it the foundation of all its blasphemies. The so-called “*Christian sects*” have laid a foundation—not from the Bible, but out of their own fancies—and Judge EDMONDS and others with him build thereon. Thus speaks the “Hon. N. P. Tallmadge,” in his letter on “Spiritual Manifestations”:—

“Let me scan this subject for one moment, and present one simple view, which, it seems to me, comprises the whole in a nut-shell. It is the belief of *all Christian denominations*, at the present day, that *departed spirits revisit the earth*, that they attend us, that they impress us to go or not to go, to do or not to do, for our good. Every one’s experience will satisfy him of the truth of this remark. What then follows? If spirits visit us, attend us, and impress us for our good, what is the objection to believing that a mode is now discovered by which they can communicate with us?—There can be no possible objection, provided the facts justify that belief. If the one is for our good, the other is still more for our good. If the facts justify it, the conclusion is both reasonable and philosophical. Do the facts justify it? I undertake to say they do. I undertake to say, too, that no intelligent mind that investigates with a sincere desire to ascertain the truth, and has the opportunity to do so, can come to any other conclusion. What, then, is the result of this mighty outcry, as if heaven and earth were coming together? Why, simply, that it has been ascertained that spirits can communicate with us, in addition to impressing us! It hath this extent, no more.”

What could be more evident than such a conclusion from the premises? If the soul is immortal, it must survive in death, actively. This belief of the sects is the *root* and the *only root* of all this *modern witchcraft*, called “Spiritual Manifestations,” or “Spirit Rappings.” Kill the roots and this “spiritual wickedness” falls to the ground. Instead of this, however, the sects are laboring, and laboring in vain, to stop the flood which their own un-“christian faith” has set in motion. We hope they will yet see, that the only way to stay that desolating plague is, by taking the Bible ground—“No Immortality, or Eternal Life except through Christ *alone* and by a *resurrection from the dead.*” This will give them a power which nothing else can.

—o—
THE OPPOSITION.—A friend has sent us four numbers of the *Zion’s Herald and Wesleyan Journal*—a Methodist paper published at Boston, Mass.—containing a series of articles headed “MATERIALISM ANTI-SCRIPTURAL; or, *The Doctrines of George Storrs Examined and Refuted*, by Rev. N. D. George.”

Several friends have written requesting us to review the articles. The great difficulty, at present, is—so far as *we* are concerned—we see nothing to review. There is not only nothing *new* in the articles—so far as they relate to us—but the writer has failed to touch the foundation stone in the argument, and spent what little strength he had in trying to remove here and there a brick from the superstructure. Let him prove—if he can—that the Lord God did not make *man* of *matter*: then he will have taken the *first* step in his mighty labor.—Either the said Reviewer is afraid to “*feel the pillars*,” or else is ignorant of the first principles of the oracles of God. If *man* was made of *matter*, then “Materialism” is *not* “Anti-Scriptural.”—Moses affirms—at the outset—“The Lord God *formed man of the dust of the ground.*” We rather think that must be “*material.*” If N. D. George can prove it is not, he should go immediately to Rome for a “*Cardinal’s hat*,” for he will have performed as great a miracle as that of converting bread and wine into “the *real* body and blood of Jesus.”

—o—
“THE SOUL.”—We have received an article from Br. E. R. PINNEY, of Seneca Falls, N. Y., on this topic. He has been with us on the Life Theme for eight or ten years; but a severe cancer on his face has prevented his continuing in his public ministry for several years past. We sympathize with him in his deep and protracted sufferings; but we are glad that his heart is yet on the truth. We have just received the following letter from him, accom-

panying the aforesaid article. We have not yet had time to examine it, but shall do so soon. If it goes into the Examiner we think not best to commence till January, as it cannot well all be published at once. His letter will give an intimation of his view of "the soul." He has recently been abroad on a visiting tour, and says:—

BR. STORRS:—By the grace of God I am home once more, and am tolerable comfortable for me.—I have been for a week past laboring under a severe cold, which has started the canker again, and it is now eating quite fast. My canker is worse than ever. I have prepared the article on 'the soul' of which I spoke in a previous letter. I feel an unwavering consciousness of the truth that "the blood is the soul." Never more so on any point, for no other point is established on so many plain and positive declarations forbidding any other interpretation. For the unconsciousness of the dead we have but one plain positive declaration, "The dead know not anything," and we rest with confidence upon it. Here we have five, the most unequivocal declarations possible. I do not see how any one can be clear on the doctrines of redemption without it. No truth is so effectual with the orthodox as this. They cannot meet it, nor can they possibly give a substitute for it.

In a conversation with a Presbyterian minister a few days since, (and a Hebrew scholar,) I saw this illustrated. He admitted at once that the true rendering of *Nephesh* was soul. I then turned to Gen. 9: 4, Deut. 12: 23, &c., and I asked him if those passages did not teach that the blood was the soul? He said it appeared so, but he could not believe it. O, well, I said, you must settle that with God; if He has revealed himself falsely on the point I cannot help it; I am only showing you what God says. I then asked him, "If God had anywhere said that any other part of man was the soul? He confessed he did not recollect that he did. We then passed on to the end of the wicked, and I soon annihilated them to his utter confusion. When he left, he said he had got some new ideas. Several of his hearers were present, and from the conversation saw his weakness on the Scriptures, and had their eyes opened so that before I left they began to see "men as trees walking," and bought all the books I had with me—"Bible vs. Tradition,"—"Death not Life," and many small tracts. The minister is in trouble for his craft, and has preached against the destruction of the wicked ever since I left. He is doing nobly for the cause. Universalism cannot stand a moment before this truth, it annihilates the whole theory at a blow.

I think I shall get this out in tract form and connect with it an article showing its bearings upon various doctrines, especially the destruction of the wicked, in a cheap form of some 32 pages at \$3.00 per hundred. I never felt so much the need of a tract condensing these points in a small cheap form as during this tour. What do you think of it? I was so unwell while in New York that I did not call at your office. Farewell. Grace be with you, through Christ. My trust is still in the living God.

As ever, yours,

E. R. PINNEY.

FROM SISTER ROWLEY.

New Lebanon, N. Y., Sept. 8th, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—As I am taking your valuable paper, and have become very much interested in the truths it contains, and have had many a rich feast in their perusal, therefore, I thought I would send you a history of my conversion to the truths and doctrines of the Bible. I say Bible doctrines, because I have become convinced that the popular doctrine is the doctrine of men, which they have obtained from tradition; in particular, the doctrine of natural immortality. We know God has implanted in every soul a natural desire for life and immortality. But it does not follow as a consequence that we are immortal.

The providence of God led me, last winter, to visit friends in La Porte, Ind., where I heard the Rev. S. C. Chandler preach. One of my neighbors was there also at the same time, who never felt an interest in the Bible; but hearing from its pages the plain truths and declarations of God's Word, has become very much interested in those important truths. We heard him preach a number of sermons on doctrinal points, and attended a Bible class in which those points were discussed. The first sermon I heard was on the state of the dead, which completely stript me of my old hope of going to heaven at death.

On examining the subject, and comparing one text with another, of the precious volume, I was convinced that there was no foundation in the Word of God to build such a hope upon; and on many other points, on close examination, I found myself in gross error. Therefore, I could not resist the truth, but embraced it at once. Whereas I was once blind now I see; and wonder why I did not see before, when the Bible is so plain on those subjects, and no intimation of a disembodied soul or separate state of existence. It is strange many people will not see when their eyes are opened. I am afraid they are wilfully blind, and sacrifice truth for the sake of popularity. Christ says, He that is ashamed to confess me before men, him will I be ashamed to confess before my Father and the holy angels.

Why do men show such a disposition to substitute something in place of God's plain declarations, "Thou shalt surely die"? Because, the natural heart is enmity to God. I am established in the doctrines of the Bible, and am seeking for life and immortality through Christ alone. I believe the doctrine of natural immortality and endless torments has done more to make infidels, and to destroy souls, than all other doctrines put together.—I have had some experience in the matter. My husband, who now lies sleeping in the grave—and will, according to the Word of God, until the resurrection morning—did not believe the popular doctrine of endless torments; therefore threw away the whole Bible. Such facts are lamentable, but so it is. I am accused of embracing error, infidelity, &c. I am happy that I can appeal to higher authority than man's judgment. God must be our judge; therefore, I dare not hold to the old doctrine for the sake of popularity; but I feel willing to suffer persecution for the sake of Christ and his cause. I am in the midst of opposers. May God

speed the day when my friends and neighbors will embrace the truth as it is, and seek for life and immortality through Christ alone, at the resurrection of the just, when He has declared He will give rewards.

I am glad to learn, through your paper, that light is spreading and truth gaining ground, and thinking men are waking up to this subject, and *good men* too, as friend "Y." says.

"Precious Bible! what a treasure,
Does the Word of God afford," &c.

When rightly understood, how harmonious and glorious in all its parts. Like an instrument of a thousand strings, when touched by the hand of one skilled in the art, each string vibrates in harmony.

A. F. ROWLEY.

FROM BR. J. BLAIN.

New York, Oct. 20, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—Aug. 27th, I commenced devoting my whole time to the work, for which I was appointed by the Prov. Com., namely, to preach, dispose of books, and especially to solicit funds for sending out missionaries. At the Conference at Fredonia, and in Buffalo, I spent three weeks—sold and gave away 240 copies of my work, "Death not Life," and a number of the Bible vs. Tradition. In these places, and at Orangeport, Honeoye, Springwater, and Dansville, I obtained subscriptions for the Committee to the amount of \$140. By occasional efforts from April till Aug. 27th, I got \$25 signed, and \$56 paid in, as noticed in the Bible Examiner, at different times—making in all \$221.—Having obtained a subscription of \$140, in 5 weeks, I am encouraged, and believe means exist, and will be forthcoming, under this wise and safe arrangement, to support all the ministers the Committee can obtain, or all who are willing to take appointments and labor as the Committee propose. I am pained to know and hear of many who are compelled to leave the Lord's work "to serve tables," who are well qualified to preach, and to aid in establishing the doctrine of *Life only through Christ*, and in rooting out of the churches the horrid doctrine of eternal torments. I should judge that more than half who hold our views, are under the necessity, a part or most of the time, thus to leave the field in which they love to labor, and which is "white for the harvest." They are *groaning* in their shops, and on their farms, while they see the desolations which error is making, and hear the cry, "come over and help us." I thank God I am not thus groaning myself, but feeling deeply for those who are, and for the truth. I shall, the Lord permitting, labor hard to release them; and call on brethren, who have "this world's goods" to aid, and not be found, when the Lord comes, "muzzling the ox that treadeth out the corn." Matt. 25: 45, I apprehend means more than many are aware of—"Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." If Christ were again on earth, would we, if but few, support him so that he could "go about doing good," &c.? Who are his "servants," whom he has sent to take his place, or do his work in his absence? Peter said, "I go a fishing"; but God soon put it in the hearts of his children to "sell their possessions," &c., and call

Peter from his nets to "feed the sheep and lambs"; and I trust the time has come for modern Peters to leave their "fishing" business, and become "fishers of men." "There is much land to possess," and "we are able to go up and possess it"; for "the Lord is working with us."

I rejoice that brethren have generally become convinced that *union* and *order* are needed in doing the Lord's work; and hope that all ministers who love our truths will soon be released from the disagreeable and unsuccessful task of asking aid for themselves, individually.

Brethren, permit me to ask your attention to Phil. 4: 10-19—"I desire fruit that may abound to your account." The Lord willing it, I design to call on many of you soon, and request an explanation of this portion of God's word, as I fear it has been overlooked by many of late.

Nearly all my work, 1300 copies, have been disposed of in two months, and I am here to make some additions and publish another edition.—240 have been given at my own expense, and the rest sold. I have also sold over 75 of the Bible vs. Tradition, and some other works. My traveling expenses have been but \$7. I purpose spending a few weeks more in Eastern N. Y., and then visit brethren in the Eastern States.

J. BLAIN.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

Gen. 11: 7.—"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Our text declares, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

Now, regarding this as a plain and perspicuous deliverance on the subject of man's constitution, *three* things present themselves for our consideration, viz., "dust of the ground," "breath of life," and "living soul."

First, then, we have *dust of the ground*, from which, it is affirmed, the Lord God formed or constituted man. The definition here given it, will be observed, is quite unqualified: "formed man of the dust;" not a *part* of man—not man's *body*, but *MAN HIMSELF*; comprehending at once all the mysterious properties and functions of his wonderful constitution. And mark, the only element introduced is *dust*, "dust of the ground," or, more correctly, "red clay," the organizing of which, by the power and wisdom of the Almighty, is emphatically designated the formation or creation of man.

Next in order we have the *breath of life*, or life-giving breath, which we are informed was infused into man, consequent upon his erection from the dust. By the phrase, "breath of life," or, more literally, "breath of *lives*," (margin), is doubtless intended] the atmospheric air, the respiration of which constitutes the life of all animated flesh. The plural form of the term, as used in this connection, expresses the perfect equality of man in the mode of his existence, with all the other living creatures; so that, in this respect at least, "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." Concerning this breath of lives, it is said, "The Lord God breathed into man's nostrils;" by which is simply implied, that,

through the agency or power of God, the organized dust, endowed with all the attributes, physical, mental, and moral, of a man, but, as yet motionless and dead, began to respire; which respiration by the lungs would at once propel the vital fluid thro' the whole system, and so produce, in the language of the record, "a living soul."

And this brings us to the last particular in the narrative, viz.; *man became*, literally, *grew into*, a *living soul*.

And here the first thing which strikes us is the marked peculiarity in the mode of expression, a peculiarity, the misrepresentation of which, by all popular expositors, has produced the most melancholy confusion in the general mind concerning what ought to be plain to the weakest intelligence—the *Scripture doctrine of the constitution of man*. This peculiarity will appear, if the reader will attend for a moment to what is affirmed to have become a living soul. Mark, God is not said to have infused *into* man a soul, but *man himself*—the organized being, is declared to have become *LIVING SOUL*. To see this more clearly, consider that *two* things only are spoken of as constituting the nature of man, viz., *dust and breath*.

Thus, in the first member of the verse, it is said, "God formed *man* of the dust of the ground," that is, according to the above definition—the *entire human being*; then, into this completely formed man the breath of life is inspired, the result of which is, man—the whole creature *becomes* living soul. Observe then, it was man, the organized and animated clay, that became living soul. Mark, not *soul* simply, but *living soul*; the force of which is, clearly, that man was to all intents and purposes a soul before his animation; by the breathing of the oxygenated atmosphere, "*man became* a living soul;" which is in other words to say, that anterior to this event, man was a dead soul—a soul inanimate; but through the inhalation of the life-giving and life-sustaining breath, he came forth a *SOUL ALIVE*; in one word, a living man, with all the sublime faculties and energies of an intelligent and moral being.

To sum up the testimony, man is nothing more and nothing less than a material compound of the two principles—*dust of the ground and breath of life*, the union of which constitutes him a *LIVING SOUL*.

Other element there is none introduced in the inspired account of our nature, which, on the ground of the principle with which we started, we now make bold to say, stands unrefutable amid all the infinite jargon of a heathenish philosophy and contradictory babble of a false and semi-pagan theology. Contradict it who may, it is the truth of God that MAN has but a MATERIAL and MORTAL constitution, which, according to the Almighty himself, was reared from the dust, and is destined again to be resolved into its kindred element.

Spirituality, indestructibility, and deathlessness, the popular attributes of a soul, are hereby ignored. SOULS ARE BUT FRAIL ORGANIZED AND ANIMATED DUST! transient and perishable as the moth; and which, unless the mercy and power of the Eternal intervene, must finally, like the insect of a day, hopelessly vanish from being, and become in the universe as though they had never been!*

whole of the first of the "Bath Series" of tracts, to be issued monthly in that city. God prosper the effort.

Ed. Expositor, [Moncrieff].

[From Ham's Christian Examiner]

THOUGHTS ON TEXTS.

ROMANS, CHAP. V. 6-11.

The object of Paul in these verses appears to be to sustain his own and fellow-believers' confidence in the certainty of obtaining salvation, and to encourage this confidence, he naturally recalls to mind the LOVE of God as set forth in the MEANS by which he and his fellow-believers became obedient to the faith. That great means was the belief of the fact that "Christ died for the *ungodly*." It was this thought that filled the apostle with admiration—that Christ should die "*for the ungodly*." "For," said he, "scarcely for a *righteous* man will one die, although it is possible that for a *good* man some would even dare to die," but that Christ should die for *bad* men, the *ungodly*! This was love indeed! Hence he proceeds, "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, *while we were yet sinners*, Christ died for us." Here then was the foundation of his belief that God, who had showed so much love in the outset, would certainly not withhold his loving-kindness in the end. On this fact then he advances to build his consolatory argument. And his logic is very simple. Surely, he reasons, if Christ so loved us when we were *sinners* as to be willing to sacrifice his personal comfort, and even his life, in the great work of converting us from the error of our ways, now that his great love towards us, in dying for us, has begotten within our bosoms a responsive love, and made us obedient to him, he will give us that salvation of Life Eternal for which, at so great a sacrifice, he has prepared us? If when we were enemies to God, and living in disobedience to his laws, Christ destroyed our enmity, to his heavenly Father, and reconciled us to him and his service, at the great cost of his own sufferings and death, surely now that we are no longer living at enmity with God, but are reconciled to him, we shall be saved by Christ and made partakers of his incorruptible life. The reasoning is simply this,—If Christ has loved us so much that, for the sake of making us personally holy, he has made such immense sacrifice, most certainly, now that we are made holy, he will not suffer us to be destroyed by that righteous "wrath," which is revealed against all ungodliness,—"*Much more then, being now justified [made personally righteous] by [at the cost and through the appealing influences of] his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by [at the cost, and sympathetic power of] the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, [now that we are reconciled] we shall be saved by his life. And not only so,*" for this confidence of ours has filled us with the ecstasy of joy, and hence "*we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation.*"*

* See the margin where the word *reconciliation* is given as the proper translation.—This is the same word as is translated twice *reconciled* in the previous verse, and the sense obviously requires that the word *reconciliation* should be preserved as given in the margin.

* The above clear exposition forms nearly the

Need we add that Paul is not here speaking of God's reconciliation *to us*, but of our reconciliation *to God*; hence, he says, *not* that God has received the atonement or reconciliation, but that *we* have received the atonement or reconciliation;—that is, as *we* had to be reconciled to God, being enemies to him, of course, *we*, and not God, have received the atonement or reconciliation. (See "Christian Examiner," pp. 79-81. Article, Atonement.)—Ed.

ROMANS, VI. 10.

"For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

In what sense Christ "died unto sin," is made very plain by the context. The apostle commences the chapter by asking, "shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" and replies with virtuous indignation, "God forbid. How shall we then that are *dead to sin*, live any longer therein?" To *die to sin*, then, means to *cease from the practice of sin*. In apostolic phraseology, a man is said to be dead to sin, who is no longer under its control and influence,—who has no eye for its attractiveness,—no ear for its invitations,—no heart for its enjoyments,—"For he that is dead," he says, "is freed from sin." In this sense Christ, when he died on the cross, "died unto sin;"—sin could neither seduce nor subdue him:—"the prince of this world cometh," he said, "and hath nothing in me." If the cross must be his penalty for resisting sin, then he would "resist unto blood striving against sin."—The perfection of Christ's nature renders him as one dead to sin, and alive only to God, and righteousness. His nature responds to nothing sinful, but only to truth and holiness. Christ's death unto sin, of which the death on the cross was the outward expression, is hence made by the apostle an *example* unto all believers. As he "died unto sin," so must also they: "*Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin*, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." If Paul's language were literally rendered it would be, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *corpses* indeed unto sin," &c., which brings out more emphatically the meaning of the phrase, "dead unto sin." Paul, we repeat, exhibits Christ's deadness to sin for the *example* of his church,—they are "likewise to reckon" themselves *dead indeed unto sin*,—and therefore he thus exhorts them in the words immediately following:—"Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God."

We need scarcely caution the reader against supposing that Paul meant that Christ "died unto sin once," in the sense of dying to bear the *punishment* of sin, or to give a *satisfaction* for sin, for if Paul meant this, he would never have held *such a death* up for the *example* and *imitation* of the church, as he does when he says, "*Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin*."—Ed. *Chris. Ex. (Eng.)*

BURY.—We have received a printed document from the Rev. F. Howorth, of Bury, announcing the formation in that town of a "*Free Christian*

Church." It rejoices us to see that the churches of our land are beginning to emancipate themselves from that mischievous ecclesiastical centralization by which, among Dissenters, as well as Churchmen, liberty of conscience and speech have been so long prohibited. Christian liberty and brotherhood are impossible on the basis of the old corrupt corporations, the churches that will be free, faithful and fraternal, must find another foundation than that on which they have hitherto stood, even that which Christ has laid, and which we think the Church at Bury have adopted, when they say, "it is based upon the principle of Freedom,—all being welcomed on its threshold who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and are willing to worship and to work in his service on the ground of agreement in spirit, rather than agreement in doctrinal opinion. Whilst strictly a Christian Church, i. e., a Church recognizing the divine authority and mission of Jesus Christ, it is designed to be unsectarian, offering the most cordial and earnest invitation to all who are desirous of manifesting their love to God by their devotion to the best interests of man, all that are anxious to *be good* and to *do good* in the spirit of our common Lord and Master. "We consider diversity of faith," it has been justly remarked, "no bar to Christian communion. We hold conscience to be sacred to God and to the man to whom it belongs. We expect freedom of utterance in the pulpit, and we claim freedom of investigations in the pew. Forswearing all human creeds, we are convinced that the celebrated motto, 'The Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestants,' is capable of an application to which it has not yet been submitted by its most enthusiastic admirers."—*Ham's Chris. Ex. (Eng.)*

HYMN BOOK.—Our last edition of the "*Christian Psalmody*" was long since exhausted. We have been waiting for months for the arrival of Br. Ham's Hymn Book, from England, which he has sent twice without its ever reaching us. By his *Christian Examiner*, for Oct., we see that he has sent it *again*. We hope it will come safe this time. It is our intention, when it arrives, to add, from it and other sources, some hundred Hymns to the "*Christian Psalmody*," and publish a new revised edition, without increasing the price. A convenient pocket Hymn Book—well selected—is what we design.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE BIBLE; OR, *The True Doctrines of the Christian Faith plainly stated and defended; With a Key to the Revelations.* By S. C. Chandler, Independent Minister of the Gospel."

Such is the title of a 12 mo. volume of 408 pages, just issued by the author at No. 8 Spruce-st., N. Y. Our traveling—preaching—publishing—correspondence—getting out Examiner, and various other matters to be attended to, have made it impossible for us to give the work an examination since we received it. We hope to be able to speak more definitely of it soon. Price \$1.

"BIBLE TRUTH DEFENDER: OR, *Popular Fables Scripturally Exploded*. By W. Sheldon. Published at Harbinger Office, Rochester, N. Y."

This is an 18 mo. pamphlet of 176 pages. Price 20 cents. We have not had time to examine it fully; but judge from what we have read that it is an excellent work. We are glad to see works multiplying on the Life Theme, tho' this work is not wholly on this topic. We do not, of course, in commending any work, commit ourself to all the opinions of the author, nor do we expect any one to do so with ours.

—o—
WARNING VOICE OF TIME AND PROPHECY. By Uriah Smith. Published by James White, Rochester, N. Y.

This work, a copy of which we have received from the author, is a neat 18 mo., bound book, of 116 pages, written in blank verse. The author says—"It is designed to give a general outline of the foundation, rise and progress of the Advent movement up to the present time, showing that it was the work of God; also, its connection with prophecy, and the prophetic fulfillments upon which it was based."

It is written in an attractive form, but how well he has succeeded in his object we cannot say, as it has been impossible for us to read it yet, but hope to do so soon.

—o—
"LIFE AND DEATH; OR, *The Theology of the Bible in relation to Human Immortality*, by J. Pantou Ham, Bristol, Eng." Also, "THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; OR, *The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Man in Death*," by the same author.

We have so often noticed and commended these works that we need say but little now. They should be circulated by tens of thousands. We have put up each of them in a double Examiner, with covers; and sell them at the small sum of *ten cents* per copy; 12 copies for \$1, and we pay the postage on them: or, for \$7 one hundred copies.

—o—
☞ SOME MEN have the misfortune to misrepresent what their opponents say or do, and build long arguments thereon. We do not accuse them of wilful misrepresentation—the Lord is their Judge in that matter—but we choose to have no controversy with such persons, as we should never be likely to come to any understanding with them.—We shall, therefore, pursue that course which we believe God and truth calls us to, and leave them to their own Master. The persons we speak of have attained an eminence, in their own estimation, it seems, above Paul, who said—"Not for that we have dominion over your faith." These can "damn" a man who does not see and practice as they do.

MEETING IN NEW YORK.—The friends of the *Life Theme*, in this city, have determined to hold meetings stately every Sabbath; and have commenced in *Mechanics' Hall*, 472 Broadway, above Grand-St. It is a very desirable and central place, easy of access, being on the first floor. Whether they will be able to keep this Hall permanently is not fully determined. We hope it may be so. The Editor of the Examiner preached there the first evening, and will probably preach whenever he is in the city. We hope all the friends will take hold in earnest to sustain this meeting.

—o—
APPOINTMENTS.—We expect to be in Boston the first and second Sundays of this month, and the week intervening. We regret to say, that circumstances seem to forbid our visit to Worcester in Dec., as published in our last. The brethren there will excuse us.

—o—
FROM SISTER JUDSON.

Rochester, N. Y., Oct. 9th, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—What you said with regard to a sectarian spirit, in your late article upon Baptism, I approve, though differing with you in your views upon the latter. Those thoughts suggested the following lines, which I transmit to you. Hoping that we may be led to see *the truth* on all points, as God views it, and at the same time maintain a spirit of love toward those who may differ from us,

I remain, yours, in the faith,

A. C. JUDSON.

SECTARIANISM.

It is a bitter root, and baneful its effects
Upon the human heart—preying upon,
And eating out, though imperceptibly,
The very life of true religion—*Love*.
It giveth an expression to the eye,
Forbidding and severe: and causeth words
To come forth from the lips, as far removed
From that pure gentleness the spirit yields,
As *Polar mountains from the burning zone*.
There is no virtue in it. Not one spark
Of vital godliness. 'Tis from beneath—
Not from above, where all is light and love;
For it is "earthly, sensual," yea, more,
'Tis "devilish." The very offspring too
Of that old "Serpent," who doth generate
All species of deformity on earth.
Away, then, with the evil. Ye who love
The holy principles of God's blest word,
And to the truthful pattern there inscrib'd,
Desire to bear resemblance, turn away
As from a pois'nous viper. Use no more
Your "Sibboleth's," or rods, or measuring lines,
But make the law, that perfect *law of love*—
The testing point—standard of fellowship.
So shall ye flourish, like the bay-tree, green
And freshly watered—and the word of life
Like rivers flow unfetter'd, while the Lord
Himself shall be well pleased and honored too.